UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,271	09/07/2004	Janice D. Ebel	BUR920040129US1	5270

45093   7590   08/01/2008

HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
HAYLES, ASHFORD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3687	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/01/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hwdpatents.com
btviplaw@us.ibm.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 June 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Amendment received on June 6, 2008 has been acknowledged. No new claims

have been added or amended, therefore claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being obvious by**

Kurihara et al. (PG PUB. 2003/0171963)

        As per Claim 1, 12 and 16, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, system and

computer program product of managing inventory, the method comprising the steps of:

        selecting an analysis duration (Figure 3, Step S2) and at least one analysis point

within the analysis duration (Figure 3, Step S3);

        determining an excess inventory with consideration of a manufacturing limitation

(Figure 3, Step S7) and an excess inventory without consideration of the manufacturing

limitation for each analysis point (Figure 3, Step S8);

        determining a trapped inventory (Figure 3, S13) based on a difference between

the excess inventory with consideration of the manufacturing limitation and the excess

inventory without consideration of the manufacturing limitation; and

        determining an impact of a policy inventory on an inventory consumption (Figure

4, Step S15).

        As per Claim 2, 13 and 17, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, system and

computer program product further comprising determining an optimum inventory for

each analysis point (Paragraph [0084], lines 25-28 discuss the product inventory target

value setting computes product inventory target values for the production plan periods).

As per Claim 3 Kurihara et al. discloses a method, further comprises selecting a

cycle time after each analysis point (Paragraph [0065], lines 36-40 discuss the results of

computations, where 30 days was set as the long production plan period, and 5 days as

each of the short production plan periods. Hence the short production plan periods are

the result of six equal divisions of the long production plan period).

As per Claim 4, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, wherein the cycle time is

selected based on a time period required for manufacturing an inventory (Figure 3, Step

S1).

As per Claim 5, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, wherein the optimum

inventory is a demand occurring within the cycle time (Table 3 depicts inventory needed

for a particular product type with a corresponding time period).

As per Claim 6, 14 and 18, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, system and

computer program product further comprising determining a total optimum inventory

based on the optimum inventory at each analysis point (Paragraph [0072], lines 35-39

discuss the desired product information storage means 200 performs integration of the

amount and time of delivery of products whose acquisition is desired input in processing

step S1, based on the production plan periods previously written to the production plan

period database 311 in processing step S4).

As per Claim 7, 15 and 19, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, system and

computer program product further comprising determining an inventory that will

be consumed in a short term, an inventory that will be consumed in a mid term, an

inventory that will be consumed in a long term and an inventory that will not be

consumed in a period of time, wherein the short term, mid term and long term are within the analysis duration (Paragraph [0199], lines 1-6 discuss files stored in the product production regulation information storage means are read, and information which must be taken into consideration when creating a production plan is read, including information related to raw materials used for the production of products, such as for example the constitution of raw materials used, consumption units, product inventory amounts, the period required from order to arrival).

As per Claim 8 and 20, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, and computer program product further comprising deciding an inventory size based on the excess inventory, the trapped inventory and the impact of the policy inventory (Paragraph [0169], lines 11-20, discuss product production instruction information storage means 600 computes, the amount which must be produced within the production plan period, the difference between the product amount acquisition of which is desired within the production plan period, and the predicted product inventory amount at the time of the desired time of delivery less the product inventory target value to accommodate demand fluctuations which may occur within the production plan period, and stores this together with the desired time of delivery).

As per Claim 9, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, further comprising determining an excess inventory with consideration of the policy inventory and an excess inventory without consideration of the policy inventory (Paragraph [0176], lines 16-22, discuss a functional device first checks whether product production instruction amounts and times of delivery are legitimate. That is, checks are performed to determine whether production instruction amounts to satisfy desired times of delivery within the production plan period do not exceed production capacities, and if production capacities are exceeded, whether this can be accommodated by delaying times of delivery, to correct production instruction amounts and times of delivery for the product in question).

As per Claim 10, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, wherein the policy inventory impact determining is based on a difference between the excess inventory with consideration of the policy inventory and the excess inventory without consideration of the policy inventory (Paragraph [0170], lines 22-29 discuss When the amount obtained by subtracting the product inventory target value to accommodate demand fluctuations which may occur within the production plan period from the predicted product inventory amount at the desired time of delivery is greater than the product amount acquisition of which is desired at the desired time of delivery, the production instruction amount for the product acquisition of which is desired is treated as zero).

As per Claim 11, Kurihara et al. discloses a method, wherein the excess inventory can be a negative number (Paragraph [0170], lines 29-35 discuss when the predicted product inventory amount within the production plan period is less than the product inventory target value to accommodate demand fluctuations which may occur within the production plan period, the deficient amount is computed as a production instruction amount up to the time of the deficiency, where a deficiency can be a negative number).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues: *"Kurihara does not disclose, inter alia, "determining an excess inventory with consideration of a manufacturing limitation and an excess inventory without consideration of the manufacturing limitation for each analysis point[.]"*

Examiner contends that Kurihara et al. discloses a product production instruction information storage means computes the amount which must be produced within the production plan period, the difference between the product amount acquisition of which is desired within the production plan period, and the predicted product inventory amount at the time of the desired time of delivery less the product inventory target value to accommodate demand fluctuations which may occur within the production plan period, where the demand fluctuations, which the Examiner is construing to be a manufacturing limitation, will compute an excess of inventory when the predictions are lower than target inventory amounts (pg. 12, ¶ [0169]).

Applicant argues: *"Kurihara does not disclose, determining a trapped inventory based on a difference between the excess inventory with consideration of the*

manufacturing limitation and the excess inventory without consideration of the

manufacturing limitation."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant discloses within the specification

that trapped inventory is an amount of inventory that is delayed in manufacturing due to

certain manufacturing limitations, yet is required to fulfill customer requirements (pg.7, ¶

[0050]), and claims that trapped inventory is determined based on a difference between

the excess inventory with consideration of the manufacturing limitation and the excess

inventory without consideration of the manufacturing limitation (Claim 1).

Kurihara et al. teaches, in Step S13, the product inventory target values are

being computed, when the amount obtained by subtracting the product inventory target

value to accommodate demand fluctuations (manufacturing limitations) which may

occur within the production plan period from the predicted product inventory amount

(without manufacturing limitations) at the desired time of delivery (pg. 12, ¶ [0170]), will

result into an amount of inventory that is delayed in manufacturing due to certain

manufacturing limitations, yet is required to fulfill customer requirements.

Conclusion

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashford S. Hayles whose telephone number is 571-270-5106. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 8:30 to 4:00 Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Gart can be reached on (571) 272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elaine Gort/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3687

/A. S. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3687